

Date: Tue, 4 Jan 94 04:30:16 PST  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #564  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Tue, 4 Jan 94                      Volume 93 : Issue 564

Today's Topics:

                    Spirit of radio...  
            The 10-meters band - No CW required ? (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: 4 Jan 94 01:18:22 GMT  
From: ogicse!emory!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!howland.reston.ans.net!  
vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!dobrowol@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Spirit of radio...  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill N8PKV) writes:  
>trd54583@uxa.cso.uiuc.edu (Cynops pyrrhogaster ) writes:

>And are FM radio's free where you live? Can I get a few?

Yes and No... I'd bet that the odds are much better that I  
can come by a used/discarded/whatever (yet working) FM radio receiver than  
finding a ham set...even with Hamfests going on all over the place. (I keep  
wishing I could run accross a nice HF set in somebody's garbage }:)

>Besides I bet that your pirate FM transmitter could work on SOME ham band.  
>So the  
>equipment issue is really a blind. You say that pirate radio operators  
>can equip themselves for 'broadcasting' but could not find equipment for  
>ham radio? Thin, very thin. (Damn near invisible!)

Hmm, I don't think that it is as thin as you make it out to be. You are focusing on the broadcaster side...while I was looking at the receiving side. Sure, a pirate can get ham equipment instead of public FM equipment. But just how many people (of his intended audience) are gonna hear him?

Furthermore, there's the whole social/political issue: With the wide outreach provided by the 88-108 MHz band...why shut down (as of 1980) low power broadcasters? Why force people to have to move to another (relatively) harder to access band just so that they can hear some worthwhile information instead of commercial drivel?

Even further still...you say that the micro broadcaster could work some ham band. For the sake of argument, let's say he did and people could somewhere get access to hearing it (scanners, radios, etc.). He STILL wouldn't be able to do what he was doing...he wouldn't be able to carry out his broadcasting objectives. I don't think it would be looked upon too favorably if someone broadcast local news or employment opportunities or readings on the history of a certain group over the ham bands and "tied up the frequency."

/lw

```
( ( | ) )      free the airwaves
|             community micro radio
/-\  "let a thousand transmitters bloom"
```

--

LunarWolf - spleen@uiuc.edu - T.R. Dobrowolsky - kb9iqx

Natural Resources & Environmental Science  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

-----  
Date: Mon, 03 Jan 94 18:07:16 EST  
From: qualcomm.com!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!  
wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Ed Ellers <EDELERS@delphi.com> writes:

```
> "Check out Class A CB some time.  It is a whole 'nother story."
>
> It is indeed, although it has long since become the General Mobile Radio
> Service.  It was created to allow BUSINESSES as well as individuals access to
> land mobile radio at a time when most businesses didn't qualify; ironically
> the FCC now will not grant new GMRS licenses to business users, since all can
```

> now qualify for business frequencies.  
>  
> -- Ed Ellers, KD4AWQ

As may be Ed, but it is STILL class A CB and under part 95.

Dan Pickersgill N8PKV / dan@mystis.wariat.org / ac447@po.cwru.edu

-----  
Moving parts in rubbing contact require lubrication to avoid excess wear. Honorifics and formal politeness provide lubrication where people rub together. Often the very young, the naive, the unsophisticated deplore these formalities as "empty", "Meaningless", "Dishonest", and scorn to use them. No matter how "pure" their motives, they throw sand into machinery that does not work too well at best. -L. Long

-----  
Date: Mon, 03 Jan 94 18:09:32 EST  
From: qualcomm.com!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

> In article <V9JkFc3w165w@mystis.wariat.org>,  
> Dan Pickersgill N8PKV <dan@mystis.wariat.org> wrote:  
> >I realize that being a contributing member of the Ham Society requires  
> >substationally more EFFORT than JUST MEMORIZING 40 simple characters.  
>  
> Sorry, but, while you may be able to level that argument at Robert, you can't  
> make that stick to me. I've spent 15 years trying to improve the two meter  
> landscape in the Houston area. Despite the best efforts of a lot of folks,  
> it's still a sewer.  
>  
> Of course, it's easy for you to point fingers and whine about CW requirements  
> and claim that it's a simple memorization task (free clue: it isn't). I've  
> served in more ham organizations in positions of responsibility, managed more  
> nets, done more public service, brought more folks into the ranks, and  
> contributed more of my time, sweat, blood, tears, and soul to this service  
> than nearly all of the college-spoiled anti-CW whiners on this net. Wanna  
> accuse me of not being a contributing member of the brotherhood of ham radio?  
> Drop dead.  
>  
> >(If the above sounds like a flame I am sorry. It was NOT intended to  
> >sound like one nor BE one. I am just tired of hearing your song and  
> >dance. Stand up and make a change. DO SOMETHING!)

>  
> I've been busting my balls for half my lifetime trying to make a change. Why  
> do you think I'm so unhappy that others are trying to tear down that which  
> I've spent so much time and effort building up?  
>  
> Relaxing requirements will only hasten ham radio's slide into ruin.

Jay, the above quoted message was addressed to Robert, specifically and personally. I was getting a bit tired of his bashing of an entire group of hams. If \_YOU\_ choose to read yourself into it, maybe a close inspection of the mirror is in order before you start issuing denials.

Dan Pickersgill N8PKV / dan@mystis.wariat.org / ac447@po.cwru.edu

-----  
Moving parts in rubbing contact require lubrication to avoid excess wear. Honorifics and formal politeness provide lubrication where people rub together. Often the very young, the naive, the unsophisticated deplore these formalities as "empty", "Meaningless", "Dishonest", and scorn to use them. No matter how "pure" their motives, they throw sand into machinery that does not work too well at best. -L. Long

-----  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #564

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*